



**Mayor
Charles C. Kokoros**

Department of Planning and Community Development

Melissa M. SantucciRozzi, Director
1 JFK Memorial Drive
Braintree, Massachusetts 02184
msantucci@braintreema.gov
Phone: 781-794-8234

MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

Jennifer Wadland, Chair
Amy Holmes, Vice Chair
David Cunningham, Member
Julia Flaherty, Member
Peter C. Herbst, Member
Justine Huang, Member
Thomas Kent, Member
Shelley North, Member
Elizabeth Page, Member
Joseph Reynolds, Member
Rayna Rubin, Member

IN LIEU OF ACCEPTANCE BY MPSC

MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE – MEETING MINUTES

Thursday – August 17, 2023 – 7:00 PM

Location: Cahill Auditorium, Braintree Town Hall, 1 JFK Memorial Drive

Meeting came to order at 7:00 PM

Members Present:

Jennifer Wadland, Chairperson
David Cunningham, Resident
Julia Flaherty, Town Councilor, District 1
Thomas Kent, Planning Board Representative
Shelley North, Business Owner
Elizabeth Page, Resident

Staff Present:

Connor Murphy, Assistant Director – PCD

Consulting Firms

Jenn Goldson

Members Absent:

Amy Holmes, Vice Chairperson/Business Owner
Peter Herbst, Business Owner
Justine Huang, Resident
Joe Reynolds, Town Councilor, District 2
Rayna Rubin, Resident

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM and attendance was taken.

MPSC Member and Staff Announcements:

Chairwoman Wadland states we will open with Member and Staff Announcements. Assistant Director Connor Murphy states there are no announcements currently. There is discussion by Chair Wadland and members regarding the drop box which is difficult to hear on the recording.

Existing Conditions Discussion

Jenn Goldson

Chair Wadland noticed that some of the questions that got sent in got lost in the shuffle, and she wondered if Ms. Goldson wanted to talk about those.

Ms. Goldson explains that her group tracks comment matrices to keep track of all the comments they get it. They looked back for Steve and Jill's comments last year, and they were addressed. Ms. Goldson is wondering if they are looking at an older version of the document. The consulting team is going back to do a memo, and they will show the comment matrices and how they responded to each comment from last year. Then, they will go through the most recent version of the Existing Conditions Report to make sure everything in the comment matrices that was addressed shows up as addressed in the Existing Conditions Report. Flavio and Alana are working together on this next week. They will then write a memo showing where everything is addressed, and if they find that there has been an error, they will say that in the memo and provide the correct information. Chair Wadland asks if anyone has any comments about the Existing Conditions Report.

Member Page asks about the Survey Monkey and wants to point out that we want to maintain characteristics of the community that we value. She wanted to include that residents want to maintain mostly single-family homes and not large apartment complexes. She thinks some of these things should be added in. Another thing she noted on page 16, under Priorities of a New Development, "When discussing transportation, participants expressed desire for medium density housing near transit". Member Page states nobody ever discussed medium density housing. Member Page thinks maybe this was done before the survey, but it is concerning to her, and she would like to see that corrected. Member Page refers to Chapter 2 under Housing and Demographics, regarding the projected population growth, there is no data to support how we came up with that projected population growth. There is a mismatch between the number of people per household and the number of bedrooms, and she thinks that is really an irrelevant statement. She doesn't think we can require people to match up the number of bedrooms with the number of housing units we have. She doesn't think that is appropriate, and she mentions that is on page 31, Chapter 2.

Ms. Goldson explains that the survey was part of Phase II and was summarized as part of Phase II in the community engagement summary. Each Phase has its own final document that the consulting team has provided. Phase I was the consulting team's best attempt to try to understand Braintree. They did the focus groups and pulled a lot of data. Phase II was the engagement phase. They did the survey, the crowd map, the Meeting in a Box, and they provided a summary at the end of this phase. Phase III was the short list of strategies. That was the final product. Phase IV is the Plan itself, which members have not seen. Flavio will talk about the Plan, and we will go through the worksheet. We will talk about how the committee wants that plan to look and what they want to be in it. About one or two pages will be a summary of the Existing Conditions, so the consulting team wants to make sure to pull out pieces of that Existing Conditions Report you feel are the most relevant to where you ended up. You already created your policies with Vision and Goals, and you already created your shortlist of strategies through the work we did in Phase III. Those are basically your policy agendas. When we put together the one- or two-page summary, we want to make sure we pull out things that support where you ended up. They worked hard on capturing every word that the members wanted to see in the way the Vision Statement is expressed and the way the Goals are expressed.

Ms. Goldson states the second piece talked about was the projections. She has a whole methodology, and she is happy to provide the members with information on where they would find that information. They have seen a lot of change in demographic trends through Covid. So older projections are not always coming true. They try to verify that when they write it up, saying that this is the best information available at the time those state agencies did those the projections. In terms of the bedroom match, they look at what size the households are that are living there and what size the units are. They don't do that to suggest that people should or shouldn't live in a certain size home. They are looking for trends and to see if the housing stock matches those trends. If you are seeing a lot of people living alone in a community or people living with one other person like a spouse, but then you see a lot of three-four-bedroom homes, you start to think that many of the people in the community might be in a house that is bigger than they can afford or be able to maintain or age in over time.

It is not to say that people are not allowed to live in homes that are large as they age or if they are a single person, but the idea is that if the community housing stock is not providing enough choice for folks, either they live in a situation that they can't afford or be able to maintain or they move out. When the consulting team looks at that housing mismatch, they look at what are the trends, how big are these households, what is the housing stock, and are we seeing any mismatch in what the trends are showing. If it seems like the consultants are saying we should require people to live in different size homes, they absolutely didn't mean that. She is happy to make any clarification needed.

Member Page thinks one of the things we are missing is that you have people that have lived in the community for a long time, as many people living in Braintree have done. They bought their home, and their mortgages are much lower than what it would cost them to move into an apartment building. Member Page doesn't think it's a case that they can't afford to live in their house anymore; she thinks it's a situation where they can't afford to move out. Member Page repeats that the medium density issue really bothers her because that is not a phrase that was discussed. She thinks it is an inaccuracy to include it. Ms. Goldson states they can look back at that, and they can remove the term if it seems not relevant to where we ended up with this plan.

Councilor Flaherty mentions, while we are discussing this, it would be helpful for her to know if there is a definition for "medium density". What comprises "medium density". Ms. Goldson can tell the members what it means to her, but there is not an official definition. Ms. Goldson provides examples. If you look at the Fenway neighborhood, that density is about 160-180 units an acre. She would view that on the higher scale of density. Low density is usually seen as single-family homes on an acre or more or even a ½ acre lot. Ms. Goldson's opinion is that you start to get into medium density when you look at single-family homes on smaller lots (like a less than 10,000 square foot lot), you look at two-family homes or three-family homes, or ten to twenty units per lot. That would all be in that middle area. Councilor Flaherty mentions that, when you have a group of very small capes clustered together on a street, it can actually be very dense. Compare this to luxury apartments and because the apartments are larger than some small houses, you actually get fewer people in the same amount of area. She thinks it would be great if we could come up with terminology that means what the people in the groups meant it to mean. Ms. Goldson states they can look back at the summary of the Focus Groups in Phase I report. They will double-check that and try to be more specific about what they think folks meant. If they can't figure it out based on the documentation they have, they will strike it out altogether. Ms. Goldson states when they write the actual Master Plan report, there will be lots of opportunity for the committee to wordsmith.

Review Final Shortlist of Vision, Goals, and Strategies

Ms. Goldson explains how revisions have been made, and she reads the following description: **The revisions here reflect the discussion from your July 20th meeting. In this version, the revisions also include my editorial revisions to enhance clarity and conciseness, reduce duplicative language, and organize the strategies within each goal. You will see now that each goal has a set of its very own strategies. So, we basically match the strategies to each goal. Note that the consultant consolidated some goals and strategies, reordered them as warranted. Some strategies ended up not making sense, so she moved the strategy to a different Core Theme, and in some instances, the strategies were there but just put to the goal they related to. We also added goals to avoid orphaned strategies.** Ms. Goldson is happy to go through those. There were strategies that basically had no home when she tried to fit them in by writing in goals that fit the strategy. Ms. Goldson explains the simplified system of numbering, which will carry over into the visual report.

Ms. Goldson asks committee members if they would like to have time beyond this meeting to review the documents provided. She explains that Flavio is going to start laying out the plan based on tonight's discussion. We can plug the text for the actual strategies in next week if you want to take until the end of the day on Monday to review them. Member Page explains she was able to access this, but she was unable to get to the links. Ms. Goldson states she pulled the plans up on screen, so we will be able to look at them tonight.

Ms. Goldson states, if the members want to take some time to look at them, you can. If you feel that you are ready to discuss them, we can. She is happy to make more edits, if you see anything else that you would like to change. Chair Wadland refers to page 7, Goal 3, and Ms. Goldson explains that we decided on that general language even when we talked about the MBTA. We had a specific one that talked about the MBTA Multi-family Housing, and that is what we took out.

Member Page points out a correction on page 4. While we are on page 4, under Core Theme 2, last line in the theme vision, where it says, “protects existing neighborhoods and revitalizes business areas”, she asks if we were going to add in “from encroachment”. Ms. Goldson asks if anyone objects to adding that phrase. There are no objections. Ms. Goldson asks if there is anything else.

Member Page refers to Goal 2: **Develop strategic community-supported economic growth plans for any area of the Town that is appropriate for increased development.** Member Page states it may not necessarily be increased, but it could be changed or different development. Ms. Goldson suggests “or redevelopment” and asks if anyone objects. Member North doesn’t object, but she discusses what department would be responsible, and Ms. Goldson clarifies that, once the plan is laid out, there will be a spreadsheet with all the strategies, what department owns that strategy, where the funding comes from or possible funding sources, and when in the next ten years the focus would be on this particular strategy. Ms. Goldson clarifies that the September meeting is the committee seeing the plan layout, and then at the October meeting you will see the spreadsheet and any changes that were made to the plan layout. That would also be when the committee approves the plan and recommends it to the Planning Board. Ms. Goldson recommends putting the spreadsheet on the website and keeping it live and updated so that any member of the community can go and look at that spreadsheet and see what has been done or what hasn't been done. It will be the Implementation Committee’s responsibility to keep that spreadsheet up-to-date.

Member Page is not really happy with Goal 1 under the Residential Neighborhood Theme. She would like to add something about protecting existing neighborhoods with consideration for maintaining density, style, and scale that is consistent with the neighborhood. Ms. Goldson reads Strategy 1B: **Amend zoning requirements to strengthen protections for neighborhoods that abut potential developments, such as by increasing zoning buffers to a minimum of 150 feet, limiting cut-through access to neighborhoods, ensuring appropriate size and scale of new buildings that do not detract from existing neighborhoods, decreasing height allowances as development transitions closer to smaller-scale residential neighborhoods.** Ms. Goldson discusses with Chair Wadland that committee members can send any other comments, and Ms. Goldson asks what Chair Wadland’s preference is for an email contact. Ms. Goldson suggests that they be sent to either Chair Wadland or the staff, and then we should consolidate comments. Ms. Goldson states she can send out a red-lined version of this document, but we will create the layout version with the changes. At the next meeting, if people say they read the changes and don’t agree with them, the consultants can change them at that point. Ms. Goldson will make a note to send the redline version.

Member Page refers to Core Theme 5, Goal 1, Strategies for Goal 1 – I, and she states she thought we decided to remove “evaluate the impacts of consolidating neighborhood schools”. It was clarified that there was discussion regarding this but no decision to remove it.

Ms. Goldson clarifies that committee members should send their comments to Connor and Melissa and copy Chairwoman Jennifer Wadland. Comments should be forwarded by Monday, end-of-day, and they will look at them on Tuesday morning.

Review Revised Future Land Use Map

Ms. Goldson would like to move on to the Future Land Use Map revisions. She explains that we made revisions based on the comments that the Planning Staff and the Mayor made to the consultants before the last meeting.

Ms. Goldson reminds the members that the changes that the Director presented last time were extending the Wood Road area out to North Street where the Flatley Offices are. They included the old Barnes and Noble, Pier 1, and Bye Bye Baby site. They also clarified the colors and the legend. They called the orange areas “Transformation Areas”. Item 5, Ivory Street Corridor, was extended down Plain Street to the Armstrong Cork area and ends at Hancock Street. The only other change was to the St. Thomas More property in the middle of the block. We originally had it as a Preservation Area, and we changed it into a Transformation Area. Ms. Goldson explains that they also added the River Trail Access Points. Along the Monatiquot River Trail, there are several new icons that are showing access points. Assistant Director Murphy clarifies that some of these access points are new projects that have been recently done. They include Middle Street, 44 Allen Street, an access point at the Braintree Municipal Golf Course, the Armstrong Site (which is planned after the dam removal), and off Elm Street. The reason we did this, as discussed with our Conservation Planner, is that the Open Space and Recreation Plan calls for the Monatiquot River Trail, and that is how it is depicted on this plan. However, there are impediments to that currently such as private property, highway access, wetlands, and things of that nature. There is hope that someday we will have that river trail, but currently these are the access points.

Member Shelly North asks for an explanation of the Multimodal Improvement Areas. Ms. Goldson explains that there will be a second page to the map, and they will write up a description of what each item includes. Multimodal Improvement Areas could be local shuttles as well as biking and walking improvements.

Member David Cunningham asks why the “T” Station at Quincy Adams was not included as a Multimodal Improvement Area. Ms. Goldson explains that their thought was improving access to/from Braintree’s Station, but, if members think that is not appropriate, Ms. Goldson can talk to Juliet Kittelson who did the transportation work for the consulting team. Member Cunningham advises that the Quincy Adams Station could be closer to certain parts of the town, and it would be more efficient to have employers provide shuttles to the closer Quincy Adams Station. Member Cunningham suggests including both stations. Ms. Goldson states that makes sense to her, and she will check with Juliet Kittelson.

Member North asks about access to South Braintree Square from the Braintree Station, and Ms. Goldson states she is happy to re-open and look at better access to the various commercial centers, as well as showing them on the map. Member North discusses linking the squares with the train stations, and that makes sense to Ms. Goldson. Although she wants to make sure there is a strategy calling that out because the map should reflect what is in the strategies. The matching strategy was found under Core Theme 3, Goal 5-Transportation Options, Strategy A.

Assistant Director Murphy adds a point of clarification that individuals can access the Quincy Adams T from Independence Avenue; so, if they were to continue through Braintree Square down Washington Street and beyond Archbishop Williams, they can access the back entrance to the train station. That makes Ms. Goldson think she should show multimodal options from the train station to the Wood Road area. In the description, she can say it could be both public and private depending on the location. Ms. Goldson explains this is not the last chance to look at this; it will be part of the plan layout. Ms. Goldson states that, if members look at this over the weekend and have more thoughts, they can email that on Monday.

Discuss Master Plan Report Layout Options

Ms. Goldson takes a moment to introduce Flavio Vila, who is new in her office. He just finished an MIT Planning Program, and he is going to be with JM Goldson LLC for a year. He is a Fulbright Student, and he has a background in architecture and urban design. He is very good at lots of things, including analysis and all the mapping that members are seeing. He is also very good with layout and design; so, Ms. Goldson brought him in to help with the layout of the plan. Ms. Goldson has done several plans for other locations that they can show as examples. They look very different from each other. The team likes to include a lot of photographs. Flavio can walk members through the different organization options.

Typically, they will start with a general statement of what this plan is about, which would come after a letter. This particular draft doesn't have the final letter. Then, we talk about the planning process, what we did, and how many people participated. We do this a little differently for each plan based on what the committee wants to see. We want to make sure we capture the key themes that came out in the policy work. Ms. Goldson highlights a plan that was done for the Town of Ipswich. Each Core Theme has its own chapter. She recommends that Braintree's plan be done in a portrait style. Ms. Goldson highlights the plan which was done for Winchester, which shows the Introductory Letter being done by the Planning Board Chair because the Planning Board approves the plan. By showing what was done for other towns, the consulting team wants to provide committee members with some choices. For the Winchester Plan, they integrated these ideas for metrics for the Implementation Committee to start to track. Flavio will talk about all these components.

Flavio Vila begins his presentation on Report Layout Options and explains that the consulting team provided a worksheet document so that committee members can customize the Master Plan. **(This document is attached as Exhibit A)**. Mr. Vila suggests looking at the sample Master Plans for Winchester, Mansfield, and Ipswich over the weekend so that you can take your time to answer the questions. Most of the questions are related to graphic design -- the structure, the organization, graphics. There is a very specific question about metrics -- which are the metrics you would like the plan to include. Mr. Vila thinks his presentation should go in order of the questions, and he notes that the questions constantly refer to the sample Master Plans. He provides Question 1 as an example where it refers to the Winchester Master Plan (pages 14 and 15) and the Ipswich Community Development Plan (pages 10 and 11). He also provides three Example Diagrams, which the consulting team pulled from the internet. Mr. Vila explains that members can choose which diagram they prefer to summarize the Existing Conditions Report. Mr. Vila explains how each option is set up. Mr. Vila doesn't think members have to decide right now, but Ms. Goldson states if they have a preference, we can discuss it. Member North explains that she likes a cleaner look and feels like the Ipswich example with a combination of pictures that were chosen, and format looks appealing. Councilor Flaherty agrees with Member North regarding the example, but the thing she is really interested in is that she wants our Master Plan to be very ?? and visually appealing. She wants it to be something that people have an easy time engaging with and understanding. She would like it to be structured with just enough visuals to keep their attention. Councilor Flaherty asks the consultants if they have a metrics that determines which style is most engaging; personally, Councilor Flaherty agrees with Member North on the Ipswich version. Councilor Flaherty asks the consultants if they measure how much the community engages with plans that are published and which format promotes the greatest engagement. Ms. Goldson states that is a good idea, but she doesn't have data on that. Ms. Goldson asks if anyone feels differently or likes any of the other examples.

Member Cunningham's take on Ipswich vs. Winchester is that Braintree has absolutely nothing in common with Ipswich, and it is not a fair comparison. He states we don't have a lot in common with Winchester either, but maybe more than we do with Ipswich. There may be some similarities with Mansfield. The one thing that Member Cunningham thinks we want to shy away from is photography that depicts pictures looking as if Braintree is Manhattan. This town is struggling with an identity crisis. There are some people in the town that truly believe that Braintree is a small town and want it to stay like that, and there are other people who think of Braintree as an extension of the City of Boston. There are some sections of the town that are densely built upon already. He thinks we need to use photographs that depict Braintree as it currently is. Member Cunningham talks about the varying age of developments throughout the town. Ms. Goldson hears what Member Cunningham is saying, and she explains if we use a format that is visually appealing with pictures Braintree as it looks today, even if we use the exact same layout as Ipswich, it is not going to give you a feeling of Ipswich because we will use actual Braintree images. Member Cunningham doesn't want it to be a scenario where we take the nice-looking buildings in town and put them in the Master Plan when we have a bunch of other buildings that are eyesores. Ms. Goldson suggests, when we talk about redevelopment opportunities, we can use a photo of Armstrong Cork. Member Cunningham mentions that Smith Beach is closed, and Sunset Lake is often closed, and we don't want Braintree to look like Crane's Beach. At the same time, we have a municipal golf course that is the envy of many places.

Member Cunningham refers to South Shore Plaza, which is the biggest taxpayer in the town, and he thinks we need to make mention that this mall exists. We want to make sure it continues to be a taxpayer.

Chair Wadland would like to see pictures of some of the many events that residents participate in. Ms. Goldson agrees and states there were a lot of photos provided during Phase I. Staff can see if there are any event photos in-house but suggests that we can also contact the Patriot Ledger. Connor Murphy will work with the mayor's office on this.

Member Page would like to agree with a lot of the comments being made. She agrees with Member Shelly North and Councilor Flaherty in that she likes the clean look. She likes it to be easy to follow. She thinks Braintree has a lot of good locales – we have Pond Meadow Park, which is beautiful. She mentions that people come from all over the area to go walking there. We also have a lot of history, and maybe we want to include a couple of pictures of some of the historical sites. She would like to see a nice, clean, easy-to-follow, uncluttered page.

Ms. Goldson understands that we are not trying to sell people on Braintree; we are trying to show a realistic picture. Member Cunningham liked what Chair Wadland mentioned in that it is not just a town of buildings – it is a town of people. We have a rich sports program for youth in the town. Ms. Goldson confirms that it will look like Braintree and not Ipswich; she also thinks the portrait format will be good. Of course, if members don't like what they see, the team is happy to make modifications.

Mr. Vila explains that committee members should look at the metrics over the weekend because ranking each metric is a longer decision. These metrics come from the work from Phase III. There is a set of metrics per Core Theme, and members have to rate them from "most important" to "least important".

Chair Wadland asks about some of the stronger themes not being represented in the metrics. An example is preventing "cut through" traffic. Ms. Goldson explains that for some of it they weren't sure where the town would get the data from, and she suggests if members have any ideas, they would be happy to check with staff on who tracks cut through traffic. Ms. Goldson thinks we may not be able to have that data.

Member North has a question on Core Theme 1, **Acres occupied by new developments built on previously open space areas**. She asks how this would be ranked. Ms. Goldson explains that, if you look at your goals that you ended up with, they wanted to give the implementation committee some ways to count your progress. The idea is that you don't want a lot of open space converted to development. If the implementation committee works with town staff to track this metric, it can be a warning sign that you're not meeting your goal. So, as Ms. Goldson explains, what things do you want to count over the next ten years? Metrics are a means for counting certain things. We cannot track everything, so this is a vote on tracking the top few metrics. Councilor Flaherty asks if she is evaluating things based on what she thinks is most important or what is easily achievable. Ms. Goldson explains that it is both. What will give you the most information about how effective the strategies that you're implementing have been to achieve your goals? Also, what is realistic that the town and the implementation committee could do a good job collecting and reporting on? Ms. Goldson asks that committee members send their rankings on Monday. Mr. Vila suggests checking the boxes for your top three metrics.

Mr. Vila moves onto Section 3, Report Structure, and explains that the chart that members are seeing on page 5 summarizes the structures of the different sample Master Plans. There are three questions on page 6 that are related to the structures, and they are straightforward questions on how you want to organize the Master Plan. Question 1 asks if you want to have the Acknowledgement Section at the beginning or the end. Question 2 asks if you want to have one chapter for Introduction, Planning Process, Context, Vision, Future Land Use Map, and Plan Framework or do you want to condense all of these in two chapters. Question 3 asks if you want to have the Future Land Use Map after the Community Vision or after the Plan Framework. Samples are shown on the screen.

Members have a discussion regarding their preferences for layout.

Mr. Vila moves onto Section 4, and they highlight pages 30-31 of the Winchester Master Plan and pages 20-21 of the Ipswich Community Development Plan. Both Plans show zoomed-in areas of each corresponding city. The worksheet asks which are the areas that members consider should be zoomed in for Braintree. Ms. Goldson clarifies that they can either zoom in on certain areas or stick to the overall community map that members have already seen. Councilor Flaherty discusses an interactive Future Land Use Map that lives on the website. She thinks that people would interact with that a lot. Ms. Goldson says it is not something they have done before, but they will look into that. There is discussion around putting zoom-in areas on a separate page. Councilor Flaherty asks, if we are unable to do an interactive map, can we have more breakaway areas in the plan. There is discussion around what areas to select for this. Ms. Goldson asks if they cannot fit four selected areas, between Quincy Avenue and Granite Street, which area would members prefer to be shown. Member Cunningham suggests, if we can do four areas, that we divide the town into four quadrants. Ms. Goldson states they will see what they can do with the layout.

Next, Mr. Vila moves onto Section 5, which talks about Icons. When we look at the Winchester Master Plan, we see that their Master Plan has three sets of icons, and Winchester has the largest number of icons. On page 22, it shows they have 8 icons for the Statutory Elements; on page 25, it shows they have 7 icons for Goals; on page 26 it shows they have 4 icons for Strategy Types. In contrast the Mansfield and Ipswich examples only have icons for the Statutory Elements. So, basically, the question is which section of the Braintree Master Plan do you prefer to be represented by icons. Ms. Goldson has a feeling that we should go with the Ipswich model, as it looks cleaner. All the icons in the Winchester model make it look busy. The only thing she would say about Winchester, even though she thinks it got busy with icons, of all the icons she found the Strategy Type was helpful because you could scan down and see is this about capacity, is this about a policy, is this about capital. There are four categories: physical or design, regulatory policies, programmatic, and capacity building. Each strategy has an icon to show what kind it is. Member North suggests making certain types of icons smaller or in a different color to distinguish them. Mr. Vila/Ms. Goldson highlight how the metrics end up on the sample, which show what they will do with the top 3 metrics that the committee chooses. It is noted that they did not do metrics in Ipswich.

Councilor Flaherty talks about text size and her preference that text be shown in digestible pieces. She likes that aspect of the Winchester design. Member North agrees with Councilor Flaherty.

Next Mr. Vila moves onto Section 6, which requests a decision on colors. There are two options: the Braintree colors, or the JM Goldson colors. Member Page asks if two colors are enough. Ms. Goldson states they will probably add one or two more colors or shades of those colors. The preference of members seems to be using the Braintree colors.

Finally, Section 7, requests a decision on the letter. On page 3 of the Winchester Master Plan, they included the letter. The question is who do you prefer the Braintree Master Plan to have a letter from: Mayor, MPSC Chair, MPSC Committee, Planning Board Chair, Planning Board (Full)? Ms. Goldson clarifies that the only statutory entity that is authorized to approve the plan is the Planning Board. Ms. Goldson presents another option, which is to have a letter from the mayor on one side, a letter from the MPSC Chair and from the Planning Board Chair. It would be a joint letter from the MPSC and the Planning Board. Member Page points out that the MPSC has changed over time, as has the Planning Board. The mayor has been the number one constant. Member Page would like to see a letter from the mayor. Councilor Flaherty thinks the letter should come from the mayor.

Public Questions and Comments

Ms. Goldson states the next meeting is September 21st, and at that meeting Flavio Vila will be here to present the layout that he will submit to members the Thursday before the meeting. This will be sent directly from Mr. Vila to the full committee. It will be a PDF for members to look at. At the meeting on September 21, you can run through any changes that you want. Chair Wadland mentions that she will not be attending the meeting on September 21.

Member Page asks if we have the other dates for the October and November meetings. Assistant Director Murphy advises that at the end of August an email will be sent out asking for a quorum for the September meeting as well as providing the other dates for October and November. Chair Wadland asks about process for the October and November meetings. Ms. Goldson clarifies that the intention is to have committee members vote to recommend the Master Plan to the Planning Board at the October Meeting, and then in November we would hope that the Planning Board would take it up and add it to their agenda. She advises that if the Planning Board doesn't approve it, then the committee would need to talk about what to do.

Councilor Flaherty asks if the Town Council approves this. Ms. Goldson explains that it is the Planning Board; in some communities they have an additional layer of approval they choose to customize and have the local legislative body also approve, which would be the Town Council, but it is not required by the state. Assistant Director Murphy clarifies that there was a discussion earlier on during the Master Plan process to present this to the Town Council after it is approved by the Planning Board. This was to be done as a presentation but not asking for approval.

Adjournment

Chair Wadland looks for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION made by Member Cunningham to adjourn the meeting; **SECONDED** by Member North; voted 6:0:0. The meeting adjourned at 8:55 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Louise F. Quinlan,
Office Manager, Planning and Community Development